DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 171 012 EC 115 221

AUTHOR Murray, Bertha S.; Martwick, Richard J.
TITLE Service Contract, or a Communication Vehicle.
PUB DATE Apr 79
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual International Convention, The Council for Exceptional Children (57th, Dallas, Texas, April 22-27, 1979, Session T-3)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Contracts; *Delivery Systems; Elementary Secondary Education; *Exceptional Child Services; *Handicapped Children; Program Evaluation

ABSTRACT

The paper describes a delivery system, the service contract, in which a non-monetary agreement is made between the Title I Project and the facility to provide services to excepticnal students. It is explained that the service contract includes a problem statement (for example "the classroom teacher needs demonstration and instruction for a sign language program"); behavioral objective (with information on the time limit, how the services will be delivered, what will be done, and how the services are evaluated); the specific activities; time requirement; and evaluation criteria. Procedures for service contract evaluation are explained in terms of the evaluation form. Five statements in support of the service contract system are given, including that specific time parameters increase motivation by facility staff and educational facilitator and that Title I "burn out" is minimized because of flexibility of time and contracts which prevent one person from being in the same facility all year. Sample forms completed for one service contract are appended. (SBH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED171012

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

57th
Annual International Convention
Council for Exceptional Children

Session T3

Service Contract System
"Administrative Management Tool for Optimum Service Delivery"

SERVICE CONTRACT, OR A COMMUNICATION VEHICLE

by

Bertha S. Murray
Division Director

Richard J. Martwick
Administrative Agent

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CEC

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Educational Service Region
of Cook County
Richard J. Martwick
Superintendent

Chicago Regional Project
ESEA Title I 89-313
William R. Zbinden
Executive Director

EC 115 821

SERVICE CONTRACT, OR A COMMUNICATION VEHICLE

A FLEXIBLE DELIVERY SYSTEM

As a supplementary service provider, Title I works back to back with facilities in the provision and support of program services. The Title I Project is unique because it operates autonomously. Although, Richard J. Martwick, Cook County Superintendent of Schools, is the administrative agent, the project is not attached to, or part of, any school district. Services are provided to students who are the responsibility of public schools. Title I staff, finds itself, on numerous occasions, exhibiting behavior similar to that of a chameleon. Adaptation to the assortment of facility environments is a critical issue. In order to respond to the diverse characteristics and philosophies of the State supported facilities, a third party professional evaluation team recommended a service contract format as a delivery system. It appeared to offer the flexibility needed to satisfy State and Federal regulations, while at the same time, meeting the unique individual needs of the facilities. After the service contract format was adopted, the project administrative staff reviewed different approaches to writing behavioral objectives and integrated them into a service contract system. This met the need for an effective management technique which would provide maximum communication. A business consultant had pointed out that poor communication and lack of objectives were the two major reasons why companies fail.

WHAT IS A SERVICE CONTRACT

For our purposes, the services contract is a non-monetary agreement between Title I and the facility, which defines what Title I will do. It establishes specific responsibility, formalizes relationships, provides a base for change, and forces planning. Negotiating a contract minimizes misunderstanding, distrust, confusion, failure, and headaches.

This is an example of a service contract (Appendix A).

Each service contract is identified by school name, division, and the name of the Educational Facilitator who will implement it. Why? This information is used to tabulate and accumulate data.

Problem Statement:

The problem statement is a written statement mutually agreed upon by both the Facility Director and Division Director. Before deciding upon this statement, the Facility Director is responsible for:

1) Assessing his student needs each spring.
2) Assessing the facility's basic program and service needs.
3) Reviewing Title I project objectives.
4) Establishing priority needs.

The Division Director is responsible for:

1) Reviewing the specific facility's needs assessment.
2) Reviewing the facility checklist.
3) Reviewing Title I project objectives.
4) Assessing the division personnel to determine service capabilities.

It is crucial that the Title I Division Director know division personnel. Does the staff include someone with expertise in the area identified by the problem statement or in a similar area? If the personnel is not available, an alternative priority may be considered. In the case of this example, the personnel was available. The problem statement is:

The classroom teachers need demonstration and instruction for a sign language program.

Behavioral Objective:

The behavioral objective is written in specific measurable terms. It is actually a concise statement whose parts are expanded upon in the remainder of the contract. This statement tells:

What the time limit is -

By December 15, 1978,

How the services will be delivered -

with input from the Educational Facilitator,

What will be done -

10 classroom teachers will learn a minimum of 60 functional signs and the appropriate methods of instructing the students,

How the services are to be evaluated -

by the Facility Director, Facility Staff, Educational Facilitator, and Title I Division Director.

Activities:

The activities are:

The Educational Facilitator will:

1) Confer with administration and staff.
2) Observe the existing signing program in the classroom.
3) Assess the appropriateness of the existing program.
4) Design a signing program where needed for individuals or groups.
5) Conduct signing classes with the teachers, before school, teach 60 functional signs.
6) Participate in the classroom to demonstrate to the classroom teachers methods of teaching the signs to the students.
7) Make materials and activities available for teaching signs to the teachers and students.
8) Make recommendations for improving the sign language program for the seven groups.
9) Select objectives for staff based on a teacher made checklist.
10) Compile pre- and post-test data.

This part of the contract is the "how to". Many times, this negotiation requires input from Facility Staff and the Facilitator. Notice that ten (10) specific activities are established for the Facilitator. This information provides the bulk of the communication and accountability vehicle. The Facilitator is expected to work within the parameters of these agreements. A Facility Director or teacher may ask the Facilitator to deviate from the contract agreement - this is where potential problems lie. The Facilitator is expected to communicate with the Facility Director and Division Director as to the progress of the contract. The Division

Director's position is to help the Facilitator succeed in the contract. If the Facilitator fails to communicate, this may not be done. In the meantime, the Division Director or Division Coordinator visits the facility periodically to do a status check. Questions pertaining to the selection of objectives, determination of pre- and post-test instrument, and feasibility of target termination dates are discussed. The two directors interact around progress and/or problems of the service contract. Communication with facility staff is ongoing because the Facilitators and teachers are working together twice a week.

Time Requirement:

This specifically indicates:

the number of days - fifteen (15),

the dates - October 26, 1978, thru December 15, 1978,

and the days of the week - Tuesday and Wednesday

The Facilitator is expected to observe these time lines and the daily time and lunch schedule of the facility. Although, the Facilitator's role is practically that of a visitor in the facility, he or she is expected to function as an ex officio member of the staff. Very little time is consumed going from one facility to another. Title I personnel usually spends the whole day in one facility. Only fifteen (15) days are required for fulfillment of this service contract. If it is successfully completed, then the Facilitator can be placed in another service contract in the same facility or another one. He or she is expected to do his own informal time line as it relates to the completion of the activities.

Evaluation Criteria:

The final step in the contract is determining what criteria are used to judge the fulfillment of the objective. This is the evaluation criteria:

The involved persons will review the data to determine:

1) That the classroom teachers have learned a minimum of 60 signs using a checklist of 150 signs.

2) If objectives pertaining to methods for teaching signs for teachers, have been met. 75% success is expected.

These criteria gives the two parties involved a chance to determine if Title I did what it said it was going to do. The contract is then signed by both directors. The original copy is retained in the Title I office and copies are given to all parties involved. It is the responsibility of the Facility Director to see that facility personnel is informed and cooperates. The contract provides for communication between the Facilitator and facility personnel. This does not always present an ideal situation. The Facilitator is sometimes seen as just an extra pair of hands. The contract precludes this situation, but it doesn't always prevent it.

Regardless of the Facilitator's expertise, communication is stressed as the most important variable. In dealing with the facility's personnel, which may or may not be certified, the Facilitator's interpersonal skills need to be top notch. When facility personnel seeks out Title I personnel and asks for additional help, that is an indicator that the communication is as it should be.

SERVICE CONTRACT EVALUATION

When the service contract time requirement has elapsed, the directors evaluate it. Appropriate staff (Facility Staff and Educational Facilitator) are in attendance, if the evaluation criteria so indicates. (Appendix B) This form allows for the same identifying information as the service contract; contract number, school name, Educational Facilitator's name, and division. Also, for our data collection purposes, space is provided for the following:

a. number of children served - direct or indirect (45)

b. number of facility staff served (10)

c. number of Title I staff involved (1)

The evaluation form is then divided into two (2) identical parts. The lefthand side is to be filled in and signed by the Facility Director and the righthand side is to be filled in by the Division Director. This form affords information as to whether "Title I did what it said it would do".

Objectives Achieved (Yes) or No

Activities Completed (Yes) or No

Verifying Instrument:

What did the Educational Facilitator use to complete the objectives:

Pre- and post-test data and a teacher-made checklist of 150 signs.

Materials and methods for signing.

Change Projected:

This comes directly from the evaluation criteria:

10 teachers will learn a minimum of 60 signs and methods for instructing students in sign language. 75% of staff will meet objectives.

Change Achieved:

This defines what has been accomplished.

10 teachers learned 125 signs. 100% of staff met the objectives.

Comments:

This contract exceeded the limits.
Suggested follow up one month later for two days.

This is the Division Director's evaluation. The Facility Director's is somewhat similar. The facts are the same.

The Reverse Side of the Evaluation:

The back of the evaluation sheet has a grid reproduced from the Illinois Office of Education self-assessment form with some modifications. There's a space for the Project Objective Number, and definition of the Educational Activity. The number of children served is broken down by handicapping condition and age. Then numbers of students are placed in columns a and b.

a - indicates the number of children served

b - indicates the number of children successful

In this example (Appendix C), indirect services were provided to forty-five (45) children. Since this type of service does not allow for success for children, the number of children would not be indicated in the a and b columns. Parent training groups have been initiated. Training has been done in sex education, and parents rights. Group counseling for parent ventilation have also been initiated. The evaluation form will be modified to record this data. At the present, the information as to number of parents is typed onto the form.

SERVICE CONTRACT - A VIABLE SYSTEM

In actual operation, the service contract has proven to be a viable system. This can be substantiated in at least five ways.

1) Specific time parameters increase motivation by Facility Staff and Educational Facilitator.

2) Title I "burn out" is minimized because of flexibility of time and contracts which prevent one person from being in the same facility all year. Utilization of staff expertise is increased. One Facilitator may work in four different facilities during one week or 10 or more facilities during a school year. Services provided may cover any one of the seven (7) areas covered by the needs assessment, from self-help to guidance and management. The major purpose is to provide change and growth for children. Training the staff, as indicated in the sample given here, may be the vehicle used for change. Toilet training individual children, gross motor programming, individual remediation in academics, setting up pre-vocational stations, swimming, providing occupational and physical therapy, developing fine motor skills through art, or team teaching, are all methods utilized to provide change. An unusual service involved assisting a school in an evaluation by North Central Association. This enabled the secondary school staff to help students identify their grade level. It also provided some otherwise lackadaisical students with the

impetus to finish high school. The length of a contract varies from one (1) day (for diagnostics) to forty (40) or fifty (50) days. The extent of the Facilitator's versatility and the facility's needs determine the number of days. As the example shows, a terminated contract may be succeeded by a subsequent contract for follow up to reinforce the first contract.

3) Initiative and organization tools are built into the contract. The person who is not naturally assertive has his work identified for him, the over-assertive person has limits set for him. However, there are instances when unexpected outcomes are evidenced. i.e.:

   a. One Facilitator (Speech Therapist) used the Video Tape Recorder for her pre- and post-test data. The facility, with a psychoanlytical philosophy, asked her to present this data at a regional meeting. This resulted in the unexpected dissemination of information.

   b. A pre-feeding training program was videotaped and shared with other schools by a Facilitator (Occupational Therapist.)

   c. Training of a non-English speaking Physical Therapist in methods of positioning children resulted in a photograph file of do's and don'ts.

   d. A Facilitator teaching a ceramics project in a workshop found herself teaching perceptual skills to the clients. This was not identified in the original service contract. Communication with the Facility Director and Division Director resulted in it being added as an activity.

4) Common communication is built into the negotiation, progress, and evaluation of the service contract by all individuals involved.

5) Behavioral or measurable terminology affords a consistent coordination of services. It builds accountability into the service delivery. The culmination of this is the evaluation of service effectiveness.

Whether you are a director of special education in a joint agreement, with forty-five (45) classrooms in thirty-one (31) schools; or with fifteen (15) classes in one building; or a small private agency, the service contract is a management and communication tool which can be utilized.

1) Needs assessment - This can be compiled by individual teachers to determine profile and priorities for the classroom.

2) Checklist of program services - This can be completed by individual teachers to identify what services are already available to the students and insure proper planning.

3) Service contract - This can be negotiated between the individual teacher and supervisor. It will provide accountability which should parallel and coordinate the implementation of students' IEPs.

4) It can be used to achieve program objectives and objectives written for 94-142.

The flexibility afforded in this project may not be accessible unless resource or itinerant teachers are used.

PROJECT GRANT OBJECTIVES

The service contract aligns with the project grant objectives. The needs assessment data is used to determine and prioritize the first seven (7) student-based objectives.

As mentioned earlier, when a contract is written, implemented, and completed, it is categorized according to project objectives. Quarterly, this data is summated, reviewed, tabulated, and analyzed in each division. The same system is used for inservice to facility staff.

CHICAGO REGIONAL PROJECT - TITLE I

N____

SERVICE CONTRACT NUMBER 3 78-79 for MANN SCHOOL in C XXX Division
(Facility or School)

S____

EDUCATIONAL FACILITATOR Bernice Small

Problem Statement: The classroom teachers need demonstration and instruction for sign language program.

(Staff Related)

Behavorial Objective(s)	Activities	Time Requirement	Evaluation Criteria
By December 15, 1978, with input from the Educational Facilitator, the classroom teachers will have learned a minimum of 60 functional signs and the appropriate methods of instructing the students as agreed to by the Facility Director, Facility Staff, Educational Facilitator, and Title I Division Director.	The Educational Facilitator will: 1) Confer with administration and staff. 2) Observe the existing signing program in the classroom. 3) Assess the appropriateness of the existing program. 4) Design a signing program where needed for individuals or groups. 5) Conduct signing classes with the teachers, before school, teaching 60 functional signs. 6) Participate in the classroom to demonstrate to the classroom teachers methods of teaching the signs to the students. 7) Make materials and activities available for teaching signs to the teachers and students. 8) Make recommendations for improving the sign language program for the seven groups. 9) Select objectives for staff based on checklist. 10) Compile pre- and post-test data.	15 service days 2 days per week Tuesday and Wednesday October 26, 1978, thru December 15, 1978.	The involved persons will review the data to determine: 1. That the classroom teachers have learned a minimum of 60 signs using a checklist of 150 signs. 2. If objectives pertaining to methods for teaching signs for teachers, have been met.

- APPENDIX A -

It is understood that any specific service provided to children shall be supplementary as specified in Public Law 89-10, Amendment 89-313. This Service Contract is not a legally binding document.

12

FACILITY DIRECTOR/DESIGNEE: Barbara Cole TITLE I DIRECTOR/DESIGNEE: John Sanders 13

CHICAGO REGIONAL PROJECT - TITLE I

	No. of Students	No. of Staff	No. of Title I
Indirect Service	45	10	1
Direct Service			

SERVICE CONTRACT NUMBER 3 78-79 for MANN SCHOOL
(Facility or School)

Educational Facilitator: Bernice Small

Division
N
C XXX
S

To Be Filled Out by Facility Director	To Be Filled Out by Title I Director
EVALUATION CHECKLIST	
OBJECTIVES ACHIEVED: (YES) NO	OBJECTIVES ACHIEVED: (YES) NO
ACTIVITIES COMPLETED: (YES) NO	ACTIVITIES COMPLETED: (YES) NO
CRITERIA:	CRITERIA:
A. VERIFYING INSTRUMENTS: Checklist of signs, methods and materials.	A. VERIFYING INSTRUMENTS: Teacher-made checklist, pre- and post-test data.
B. CHANGE PROJECTED: Classroom teachers will learn 60 signs. Materials and methods for teaching students will be learned.	B. CHANGE PROJECTED: 10 teachers will learn 60 signs and materials for teaching children. 75% will meet objectives.
C. CHANGE ACHIEVED: All teachers learned 125 signs. Activities, materials, and methods for teaching the children have have been demonstrated and provided.	C. CHANGE ACHIEVED: 10 teachers learned 125 signs. Post-test data indicates 100% met objectives.
COMMENTS: The signing program has improved greatly.	COMMENTS: 2 day follow up contract recommended.
Barbara Cole	John Sanders
FACILITY DIRECTOR SIGNATURE/DESIGNEE:	TITLE I DIRECTOR SIGNATURE/DESIGNEE:

- APPENDIX B -

TITLE I OFFICE USE ONLY

PROJECT GRANT OBJECTIVE # 12

Educational Activity: Staff Related/Total Communication

Primary Handicapping Condition

No. of Participants By Age Range	TMH		EMH		PH/C		MI		LD		VI		H of H		D		D/B		SLI		EH		BD		OHI	
	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b
0 - 2																										
3 - 5																										
6 - 17							45																			
18 -21																										

In "a" above, place total number of participants

In "b" above, place number of successful participants

- APPENDIX C -